

#### D. Remarks

The claims pending in the application are 14-17, with claims 14 and 16 being independent. These claims replace claims 1-13, which have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the new claims may be found in the cancelled claims, as well as in the specification at page 13, lines 15-23. Also, the specification has been amended to correct obvious typographical, grammatical and syntax errors to conform the text better with proper idiomatic English. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present claims is expressly requested.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite. Claims 1-6 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious from U.S. Patent No. 6,074,692 (Hulett) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,138,354 B2 (Hampden-Smith). Claims 7-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious from Hulett in view of Hampden-Smith in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,955,215 (Kurzweil).

Since all rejected claims have been cancelled, the above rejections are moot and should be withdrawn. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 14-17 are patentable over the cited art. These claims are related to a process of manufacturing a catalyst layer and a fuel cell. In this process, droplets of a solution containing conductive particles carrying thereon a catalyst are ejected onto a surface of a polymer electrolyte membrane or a surface of a diffusion layer by an ink-jet process such that there are portions where the droplets are isolated and portions where the droplets partly overlap.

Hulett is directed to a method for manufacturing a membrane-electrode-assembly for a fuel cell. As the Examiner acknowledged in the Office Action, Hulett does not disclose or suggest coating using an ink-jet process. While the Examiner cited Hampden-Smith for the use of the ink-jet process, this reference does not disclose or suggest ejecting droplets such that there are portions where the droplets are isolated and portions where the droplets partly overlap, as is presently claimed. Kurzweil was cited for a teaching unrelated to ink-jet deposition and lacks the same disclosure regarding the claimed ejection of droplets as Hulett and Hampden-Smith.

Wherefore, expedient allowance of the claims and passage of the case to issue are respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason M. Okun/  
Jason M. Okun  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 48,512

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200